New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Waldo, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	2.52	One month	.50
One year	5.04	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.29	One month	.50
One year	15.28	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Naïve Self-Assurance.

Mr. William F. McCombs has sent out this letter soliciting support in his campaign for election to the United States Senate:

My Dear ——: The very grave domestic and international problems this country must solve in the next few years make it especially important that the State of New York be represented in the United States Senate by men thoroughly equipped to fulfil the duties of their office, inspired by a real desire to serve the nation and determined to protect the interests of our state, which shelters one-tenth of the population of the country and pays a very large proportion of the total taxes raised for the support of the Federal government.

May I not count upon your support in the present campaign? It seems to me peculiarly necessary that the men of achievement in our community should rise above considerations of party and preserve the mental stature of the Senate.

Thanking you in advance, I am, my dear ——, Very truly yours. W. F. M'COMBS.

There is no false modesty about this naïve appeal to "men of achievement in our community" to "preserve the mental stature of the Senate" by helping to elect Mr. McCombs. We learn from a sketch of Mr. McCombs's career, in "Who's Who in America," that he was born in Arkansas and came to this city to practise law in 1901. His only public activity here has been his management of Mr. Wilson's campaigns for nomination and election in 1912.

We certainly do him no injustice in saying that he is as yet in no position to claim any representative quality as a New Yorker. He is very nearly a stranger to the interests of the state—to its history, its traditions and its habits of thought. He owes his nomination for the Senatorship solely to the favor of Tammany Hall, which is accustomed to reward with such honors Democrats from Southern states who settle here and are willing to look to it for political mentorship and promotion.

The question whether or not the "mental stature of the Senate" will be preserved by Mr. McCombs's election we leave to be fought out between him and the present membership of the "greatest deliberative body on earth." But whatever may be his own "mental stature," he is plainly not fitted by residence, acquaintance, training and associations to represent New York in the Senate with either efficiency or distinction. It would be an egregious blunder for the people of New York to send to the Senate a man who has lived in this great community so short a time, who has never served it in any public capacity, however minor, and who has never had an adequate opportunity to put himself in touch with its interests and its life.

The Public Needs Protection.

It is to be regretted that the conferences to settle the milk strike have again come to naught. Against their wishes and judgment, the distributers have made a big concession in agreeing to pay the price demanded by the farmers. This is eloquent testimony regarding the difficulty of their present position, it is true, but it does show a certain regard for the babies which need the milk. It might well serve to bring some concession from the dairymen, who are holding out for a six months' contract at the new price, instead of the contract for one month, which the companies are willing to make.

This city will welcome an ending of the milk shortage, which has already brought its pinch to the poor. The longer it continues, the greater must be this hardship in intensity and scope. But what is desirable is not a makeshift settlement, such as is in prospect, but a settlement based on well-established facts, one which the public can understand thoroughly through knowledge of those facts, and one which by its justice will give assurance that the trouble will not arise again. Such assurance could not come even from a six months' contract. The present negotiations take into consideration only the farmers and distributers. Certainly, if the companies pay the increase to the farmers, that increase will come out of the consumers, and, it may be, a little added to it. Against this the public will have a right to protest, unless it can be proved satisfactorily that the prices to consumers heretofore have been too low.

The public is in the unfortunate position of needing milk and having to buy it, no matter what the cost. Its chief hope now is in the result of the Wicks legislative committee's investigation, which should be able soon to report with authority as to the cost of production of this necessity, the cost of handling it and the profits—or losses—which existing business conditions yield. From its report and the results of the Attorney General's investigation the consumers should be in position to obtain information which during this controversy they have had to obtain from the warring factions, necessarily prejudiced sources. On such unprejudiced information might be based appropriate action for the protection of the public from undue exploitation by either faction—if necessary, by legislative action.

An Unfulfilled Campaign Pledge.

It is not alone for bread or milk that the unfortunate ultimate consumer has to pay higher prices these days. Whether he takes his bread with New York State cheese only, or with beefsteak and various vegetable accompaniments, each item in the meal makes a bigger hole in the family purse than it did a year ago. Even the humble onion costs a deal more. Restaurant prices reflect this advance in the cost of foodstuffs—in fact, some of them anticipate it. Even boarding houses and the table d'hôte restaurants of the side streets have fallen into line.

America is prosperous, and there are jobs for all who can work. Yet ever and anon comes a tale from some social worker of a hard-working family where meat, even a cheap cut, is a most unusual viand; the butcher around the corner laments that his business is suffering because only the very wealthy can afford to buy as they used to do; the greengrocer near by repeats the story in terms of potatoes, cabbages and fruits. In spite of overtime work, bonuses and raises in rate of pay obtained by various labor unions, the war prosperity seems not to have reached many classes of workers, while the raise in prices of foodstuffs has hit all.

One of the pledges of the Democrats four years ago was to reduce the cost of living. Their campaign orators are singularly silent on this unfulfilled promise this year.

The Conventional Sex.

The hard, round, shiny derby hat is once more mounted on a million male skulls and once more freedom droops her head. What hope is there for a sex so bound to stupid custom! The chained eagle on a stump at least longs for better things. These derby wearers snap on the fetters themselves—with a whole windowful of rich and varied headgear to choose from they push in to buy the conventional worst.

Men have delighted to picture weak woman as the slave of fashion. She changes her figure, her weight, her complexion, her very habits of life, whenever society directs. Poor silly creature! Yet for the few superficial conventions of women, what of the endless solemn and immutable laws of the sacred masculine existence? Sticking to an eternally unbecoming derby hat just because every other fellow does is surely not less hidebound than buying a new bonnet to look gay in. The same is true of the whole sad, drab uniform to which the male sex has sunk.

When you come to the dignities of life mighty man is an even more pathetic coward. Women like short cuts and take them merrily. Your true male is ever afraid of being conspicuous, of attracting attention, of appearing not to know. Pride holds his neck stiff and his lips shut. On any automobile trip it is Henry who will not ask the way because he feels obligated to pretend that he knows it—and therefore wanders around Robinhood's barn while Jane pleads for a query. Some ancient halo of omniscience probably accounts for this trait, though goodness knows that every wife sees through such tactics before they are begun. Also it is the male who will not be shouted at. What wife has not been abashed by the unseeing, frosty silence accorded her for a raised voice, the raising being the short and obvious method of communicating an idea through a door or across a hall?

The one consistent habit of a woman is her unexpectedness. The average male is just about as unexpected as a derby hat. If this seems too depressing a view of a great and noble sex it should be remembered that the annual return of the derby hat is a most depressing moment—and that if the hat doesn't fit you needn't put it on.

A Superhuman Genius?

Mr. Caspar S. Yost, noted as the editor and expounder of that loquacious and perplexing ghost Patience Worth, has undertaken to answer some sensitive critics whose ears were shocked by the motley style he made bold to describe in a preface to her works as "in general the English language of about the time of the Stuarts." In a letter to "The Evening Post" he still maintains stoutly that his original opinion on her diction is one he has "found no reason to change materially"; nevertheless, he admits in the same breath that "her phraseology is for the most part unique," and his critics could, after all, hardly expect a more material modification. Mr. Yost finds authority in one period or another for "virtually every word" used by the ingenious Patience, but as to her syntax he throws up his hands and confesses freely that in the main it has "no discoverable counterpart in the English of any particular place or time"!

This disposes pretty thoroughly of the arguments used by those who thought her language evidential of her ghostly character, though it does not at all affect the literary value of her writings. Mr. Yost is rather inclined to think it enhances it, "the chief wonder" of her style being that it is of no age, yet "is made the medium of a literature that is highly praised by many critics." So far, so good; but delightful as her poems and prose essays may be to many readers, would they have made much of a noise without the suggestion of ghostliness?

Mr. Yost apparently holds that there is still sufficient reason to credit their supernatural, or supernormal, origin; indeed, her very inconsistencies strengthen his faith. He thinks "the imitation of an archaic literary style of any definite period is comparatively easy," because one may be guided by "ascertainable rules"; that "there would be no great wonder in the language of Patience Worth if one could put a finger on any locality and time." The real wonder is that her style "eludes location" and "belongs, as a whole, to no age"—it is this circumstance that constitutes the real problem which she presents in this form: "Could any human being do what I am doing in the way I am doing it?"

So that now we are implicitly invited to admit that it is easier to compass a perfect imitation than to produce a jumble of odds and ends governed by no rules except those established by the jumbler. Clearly, then, Patience Worth is obliged by the new rules to depend entirely on her own literary merit, for no one surely could pretend that it was impossible for a human being to collect the words she uses. If it is not beyond human power to verify them, it is not beyond human power to find them. Hence it follows that the question she puts to us has to do not with the mere gathering of words and phrases but with the use she makes of them. Her challenge in effect amounts to this: Are my writings works of superhuman genius?

It is proper to leave the answer to spiritists and critics of letters, but it is desirable that the question should be presented clearly to them. If it be "comparatively easy" to imitate a particular style, it is manifestly much easier to create a literary patchwork unconfined by rules. Such a feat would not in itself be too difficult for an ordinary human being. Patience is right: the question is whether a human being could do it *in the way she is doing it*. In other words, does her genius surpass that of all human authors? If not, the evidence of her ghostliness is gone. But whatever the answer it must be clearly understood that her merits cannot be decided upon archæological or philological standards. She must be judged in future as we judge Shakespeare and Gertrude Stein.

Our Tiny Army.

(From The Washington Post.)

The total population of Russia, according to statistics for the year 1915 made public at Petrograd, is 182,182,600 persons. This is an increase of 53,000,000, or 43 per cent, since 1897.

Out of this population Russia has a total war strength estimated at 5,400,000 men. Her total available unorganized resources number 29,419,920 men.

At the present time Russia has in the field not less than 3,000,000 men, but it is her army at peace strength that makes the most interesting comparison with the resources of the United States.

Before the European war Russia had an army of 1,384,000 men. Thus, with a population less than twice as large as that of the United States, her peace army was thirteen times as large as the present regular army of the United States.

The same comparison might be made with respect to the peace armies throughout Europe. Even Great Britain, depending largely upon her navy, nevertheless had a peace army of 138,000 men, with 2,743,986 reserves. Japan had an army of 250,000 men and 1,250,000 reserves.

The army of Belgium before the war was about the same size as the army of the United States. Sweden had a larger army. Rumania's was much larger and Turkey's was three times as large.

Even the neutral nations of Europe have greatly increased the size of their armies, but while Congress provided for a paper increase to 175,000 men, it was provided that the increases should be made in allotments of 10,000 men a year. Incidentally, very little progress is being made with recruiting, and the army of the United States is still one of the smallest in the world.

A New British Habit.

(From The Manchester Guardian.)

We acquire new habits as we learn new disciplines in war time. One of these is the habit, surprisingly grown this year, of gum-chewing. It appears that the consumption in England has gone up more than sixfold in three months, and that since the beginning of the great advance chewing gum has taken its place among regular army rations. Although the Canadians demanded it, we may not put the blame on them. The simple explanation seems to be that munition workers and soldiers on the march and in the trenches wanted something to chew, and gum, being a more or less innocuous commercial commodity, has leaped into an immense popularity. The result is likely to be that at the end of the war England will be on the way to being a gum-chewing country like the United States. The chewing of gum may not be a particularly injurious vice, but it certainly is not a pretty habit. The traveller in America is apt to find himself drawn into a fascinated study of its manifestations. He sees the conductor and the liftboy, the girl clerk and the "saleslady" rhythmically working their jaws as they go about the leisurely business of the day, and as his eye ranges along the corridor of the subway or the elevated train he begins to marvel at the waste of power in the moving mandibles of a million sober citizens. There is clearly a satisfaction in the exercise, and possibly a more positive solace than is to be obtained from a cigarette. It may be argued that the American chin owes something of its force to the chewing habit practised from infancy. Be that as it may, it seems likely that one more link in the community of ideas and habits has been established between us and our cousins across the water.

Our Youngest Major General.

(From The Philadelphia Inquirer.)

Galusha Pennypacker, who has just died, was not only the youngest general officer in our Civil War, but was one of the most useful. Had it not been for his many wounds there is no doubt that he would have risen to command of the army, as he would only have been eligible for retirement eight years ago. Entering as a private in a Pennsylvania regiment, he was a major at seventeen, a brigadier general and brevet general at twenty-one, having served in as many battles as one man could have done, and having received many severe wounds, on account of which he later retired from the service. At twenty-two he was a colonel in the regular army, an achievement never paralleled in this or perhaps any other country save by personal influence.

General Pennypacker had not the slightest military training, but seemed to have been born for the field. He served many high officers and always with distinction, and is one of the few men of less than army command rank mentioned by General Grant in his memoirs. He will be best remembered as one of the three brigadiers sent under Ames to take Fort Fisher, in January, 1865. It seemed a hopeless task, since the assault was directly against well constructed fortifications and the force was weak. Yet it proved successful at bloody cost and was a blow to the Confederacy from which it never recovered; was, in fact, the death knell of Confederate hopes, as it cut off the last resort of blockade runners.

THE FIRST CIVILIZERS OF EUROPE

From Thrace to the Armenian and Albanian Races of To-day.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A correspondent recently pointed out in The Tribune that the late Seth Low was an ardent admirer of Armenian and Albanian antiquities. It seems a long way from Mount Ararat to the seacliffs of Valona, yet both countries have sprung from the same fountain head, both historically and linguistically. The first civilizers of Europe were not the Hellenes, as is commonly assumed, but their Thraco-Illyrian cousins. The Thracians, being prosperous traders in antiquity, set up mercantile depots in ancient Troy and Armenia. The early Greek settlers, restless and progressive as they were, profited by the commercial efficiency of their Phœnician teachers, whose merchantmen carried Syrian dyes and other Levant goods to every West-Ægean port. Thus ancient Greece became a keen and troublesome rival of the old established business world in wealthy Thrace. The ultimate outcome of that constantly growing economic friction was the Trojan War, the first trade war ever waged in Europe. "The day will come when sacred Ilion falls," was Princess Cassandra's prophetic utterance in the Homeric rendering. Her father, King of Troy, was Priam. The name signifies "buyer" in the Greek language, and seems to indicate that the Trojans, at least in the opinion of Hellas, were a nation of shopkeepers.

Armenian, which Seth Low regarded as one of the finest mediums of expression, is, like the vanished Trojan tongue, derived from Thracian, which, too, is long extinct, while Illyrian, the supple sister speech of Thracian, has given birth to modern Albanian. Armenian and Albanian are kindred languages, but their common characteristics are often buried beneath a profuse overgrowth of alien vocables. The two countries have been vegetating under foreign rule and never had a real chance of developing their wonderful national culture. It is sincerely to be hoped that this war, which champions lesser nationalities, will also give Albanians and Armenians, if not political independence, at least a wide extension of local self-government. ERNEST P. HORRWITZ.

Formerly lecturer in Sanskirt and Indian literature at Dublin University, Trinity College.

New York, Sept. 30, 1916.

An Author Regrets Unionization.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Though a member of the original committee which submitted the report favoring affiliation by the Authors' League of America with the American Federation of Labor, I consider the proposal inadvisable under the existing circumstances, and am in favor of the league taking no further action in the matter. In making this statement of my present position I wish it distinctly understood that I am speaking only for myself, and that in no degree do I pretend to represent the opinion of other members of the committee on affiliation.

My reasons for taking this position are as follows: When the report favoring affiliation was submitted to the executive committee it was submitted with a recommendation that six months or more be given to the open discussion of the proposition before the league as an organization should take any action—and there was at that early time a generally expressed opinion among the proponents of the proposition that if during this open discussion even any considerable minority opposition to the measure should develop, we ourselves would do what lay in our power to defeat it. Our openly expressed position was that the unity of the league should be our foremost consideration, and that we would oppose any course which might threaten a serious split in the league.

To my mind, this open discussion ordered by the executive committee has revealed that degree of opposition to the proposal which we had in mind as being sufficient to warrant our coming out against our own measure. Personally I believe as strongly now as I did six months ago in the benefits that would result from affiliation, but since I place the harmonious development of the league above all else, it is my purpose to do all that I can as a member of the committee on affiliation, and a member of the executive committee, to secure the formal withdrawal of the proposal. LEROY SCOTT.

New York, Oct. 4, 1916.

"Blighty."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Without wishing to precipitate a philological discussion in your timely columns, I should like to offer the following remarks on the origin of the British soldier's war-slang word "blighty."

In India the word "Bilayut," or "Bilayati," is found in the vernacular to stand for Europe or European, and in this lingua-franca, used by the Urdu-speaking north and the Hindi-speaking east, west and south, has been corrupted from the pure Urdu word of the north, "Wilayat." Urdu is a fairly classical language, largely made up of Arabic and Persian elements, brought to India by the Mughal conquerors and engrafted upon the native Hindi, which is of Sanscrit origin. Thus wilayat is really an Arabic word, meaning a kingdom, a province. But in its corrupt form in the vernacular it became with Indians and Europeans Bilayut. Thus soda water is called Bilayati-pani, or European water.

The origin and subsequent popularity of blighty I tentatively explain as follows: The sentimental hope of the average soldier or civilian in India is a speedy or temporary return to England at the close of service. More than a brigade of French's "contemptible little army" was made up of British troops from India whose Indian service was nearly over and were thus cheated of their return to England or Bilayut. When these Anglo-Indian veterans were wounded and sent across the Channel they at last achieved their desire, and their "blighty wound" was naturally adopted by the new citizen army.

W. G. TINCKON-FERNANDEZ.

New York, Oct. 3, 1916.

Spoiling a Street.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: For some weeks past I have noticed certain sections of the city that are usually well kept littered with papers and other refuse. I have in mind particularly a block in Harlem on the east end of which there are rows of private houses and well-kept dwelling houses. Further west, on both sides of the street, there are stores, and it would appear that all their paper is swept into the street. The sidewalk is ever full of garbage and bundles of paper. This small part of the street not only endangers the health of the other citizens and breeds vermin and other annoyances, but detracts materially from the good looks of an otherwise respectable street.

Is the Street Cleaning Department becoming lax in its duties? Cannot these few careless, untidy people be prosecuted by fine or imprisonment when they jeopardize the health and wellbeing of their fellow citizens and when they destroy the general good appearance of the city?

CONSTANT READER.

New York, Sept. 28, 1916.

THE MILK FARMERS' PROTEST

Letters from Dairymen Explaining Why They Believe a Union Is the Only Means for Meeting the Conditions They Have Faced for Years—Their Returns Net Less than Laborers' Wages—If Conditions Do Not Improve, They Must Go Out of Business.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Some of the writers of the local press while indicating an open mind on the question of an increase of price to the producers for milk, are inclined to protest against the organization known as the Dairymen's League.

The milk producing farmer's life and that of the members of his family old enough and well enough to work, has been as a general rule a hard one for many years. Theirs is not an eight-hour day, or a ten or even a twelve. Often it reaches fifteen strenuous hours in the season of seeding and the gathering of crops, and in the great majority of cases the financial outcome at the end of the year is pitiable, for it often happens that the receipts over the current expenses are not equal to the going value of the farmer's labor, thus leaving no return for the use of the capital invested, which is substantial.

Any one familiar with the hesitation of insurance companies to insure their buildings; the savings banks and mortgage companies to loan them money upon bond and mortgage; the prices of farm lands in this state as compared with forty years ago, and appreciative of their untiring industry, economy and practical intelligence as a class, must suspect at least that they are not receiving a fair return for their contribution toward the public weal. Acquainted with their splendid citizenship and their untiring efforts for home and country from my youth up, I know that the value of their contribution toward the general good has by far exceeded their reward.

A farmer, or all of the farmers of the neighborhood, or even of a county, may try to increase the price of their milk, but they will only succeed in disclosing their impotency. A few large distributers have heretofore stated what the price should be and that ended all discussion. The farmer may point to the increased cost of the feed he must buy for his dairy, but it will not help him, because the distributers know that his land is not adapted to fruit growing or grain raising, but only to the raising and keeping of cattle. But some will say, "If the price paid him will not compensate for his labor and capital invested, he can make butter or cheese or raise beef cattle." There was a time when he and his neighbors built and operated either a creamery or a cheese factory. Later, a representative of one of the giant milk companies visited them and assured them of better results from a sale of the milk, so the plant was put to other use or allowed to go to destruction, and then there was no choice but to take what was offered for their supply of milk. As for the raising of beef in this state, it is not practicable. There are no longer local marketmen who slaughter. They buy their beef from the great houses of the country, such as Armour & Co.

The distributers are but few in number compared with the producers. It seems to be not difficult to bring about a meeting of minds on their part as to the price to be paid for milk. They lower and raise the price from time to time as will best advance their interests. Must the producer deal alone with this present master of the rate for both producer and consumer, or should the producer be permitted through an open organization to contest the question with the secret organization of the distributer? The latter appeals to the public who need milk for support as against the farmer, on the ground that the latter keeps the milk at home which the people need. But the public should remember that the distributers can have all the milk they want if they will pay the price asked, which is believed to be just by men who have given the subject careful consideration. ALTON B. PARKER.

New York, Oct. 4, 1916.

Fair Profits Wanted for Both Sides.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Borden and Sheffield Farms companies have been so powerful the individual dairyman has had no choice but to accept the price put upon his product, whether it paid any profit or not. The farmer knows that vast fortunes have been made out of the distributing end of the milk business. Do you wonder that he wants a fair price?

Remember, the dairy farmer's day begins at 4:30 a. m. and lasts until 6 p. m., or later, and the cows must be milked on Sunday as well as other days.

It is true we need the middlemen, but is there any reason why it should cost so much more to put the milk on the market than it does to produce it?

Please consider the following prices which the Sheffield Farms Company paid for the months of April, May and June, 1916:

For milk complying with the state standard—testing 3 per cent butter fat—in the month of April they paid the munificent price of 2 21-47 cents per quart. For grade "A" milk, testing 4 per cent butter fat, they paid 3 24-47 cents per quart. In May for milk testing 4 per cent butter fat they paid 2 41-47 cents, and in June 2 36-47 cents per quart. The consumer paid 10 to 12 cents all the time.

The farmer does not wish to make the price higher to the consumer, but he thinks between these prices there should be a fair margin of profit for both middleman and farmer without increasing the price to the consumer. A FARMER'S WIFE.

Coleman's Station, N. Y., Oct. 2, 1916.

Better Milk for a Good Price.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Very little information, coming direct from the striking dairy farmers, has been published in the New York papers. It is only natural that the New York newspapers should have as their first concern the interests of the consumer, who will be greatly inconvenienced by the present strike, but it is only fair that they should present at the same time the attitude of the farmers.

As a dairy farmer in one of the leading strike sections of New York State, I wish to enter a protest in behalf of the Dairymen's League and its demands. At the same time I would like to suggest that The Tribune send a reporter into the rural dairy districts to secure a just viewpoint on the present situation.

The Borden and Sheffield Milk companies in their recent statements have constantly referred to the strike as the result of agitation from an outside source. This is untrue. The difficulty has not been the result of a month or a year's agitation, but has come as the result of several years of financial losses.

The margin between the amount received in the milk check and the amount paid out for labor, grain and stock has been so small that it has left nothing for interest on the capital invested or for the labor of the owner and his family. Milk at the prices which have been paid to the producer the last few years has been produced with the unpaid labor of the women and children as the sacrifice.

A condition such as this cannot long continue unless the United States is willing to have the independent land-holding, dairy farmer a thing of the past, and to have in his place absentee landlordism with all its evils and the peasant scale of labor. The milk company has set the price which the farmer is to receive for his produce and the feed dealers have set the price for grain until the farmer has been screwed into rebellion and organization.

This organiaztion has come in the form of the so-called "Dairymen's League." Its officers and leaders in each section are farmers and its purpose is to secure a living wage and a right for the farmers to have some voice in the price which they are to receive for their produce. Borden's and Sheffield have widely advertised their increase in the price of milk to the farmer. This increase is about one-half a cent a quart. The league, after a careful investigation of figures, maintains that the farmer cannot afford to sell his milk without a one cent increase per quart. Individual farmers all over the state find that they must have this increase as the minimum. It is true that since the strike began the league prices have been offered in a few places. The league is fighting now for a universal price throughout the state, and this could not be obtained if individual contracts are made. An individual can accomplish nothing in a fight of this kind. It requires organization, loyalty and sacrifice to all concerned.

The farmers of New York State regret the hardship that this strike will cause the consumer. They feel that an investigation will prove the justice of their demands and that the milk dealers can well afford to supply milk to the consumer with no increase in price. The farmers do not wish to lower the standard of the quality of their milk, as the statements of Sheffield Company might lead one to believe; they wish to receive a price which will enable them to produce even better milk at a price which every American citizen has a right to expect for his labor.

A. MACDONALD.

Delhi, N. Y., Oct. 2, 1916.

"NEW WINDOWS ON THE SEA"

Turkey Should Be Extinguished and Judea Created.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The article by Mr. Frank H. Simonds entitled "Russia's New Windows on the Sea," which appeared in the Sunday Tribune, is a most excellent exposition of an intricate subject. Mr. Simonds should be complimented for his noteworthy and exact knowledge of the Near Eastern question—a question so little known in this country—and also for the skilful and logical manner in which he has used the knife in dismembering the possessions of the moribund Turk. That Turkey was the principal cause, as she will be the principal prize, of the Great War is too well known a fact to need further comment here. That the success of the Allied arms will bring about the reconstitution of the Turk's dominions, if not the total and immediate termination of the Turk's rule, is also a fact that is recognized in all quarters. But certain reasonable exceptions may be taken to some of the arrangements suggested by Mr. Simonds.

The principal reasons for the dismemberment of Turkey are that the Turkish rule from its beginning to this date has been incompetent, incorrigible, oppressive to the Moslem and unspeakably brutal to the non-Moslem; that the Turk has no valid title to the lands which he has so long occupied, because he has created no improvements; he has done absolutely nothing for the wellbeing of those in his custody; that he has uniformly behaved as an irresponsible trespasser; that his record offers no hope for improvement in the future, and that the sufferance of the Turkish rule for over 150 years has become possible not by the ability and fitness of the Turk, but because of the disagreements among the Great Powers as to the disposition of the territories in his custody. If these are good and sufficient reasons to justify the dismemberment of Turkey, then they leave no justification and excuse whatsoever for the maintenance of any Turkish state at all.

The territories allotted to England, Italy, Greece and those assigned to Russia, with the exception of Alexandretta, Armenia Minor and parts of greater Armenia, and to France, exclusive of Judea, are in accordance with the principle of nationality and the recognized rights and interests of the powers in question in the said territories.

It is believed that the disposition of Alexandretta has not been definitely determined as yet. France wants it as a port, with the best harbor facilities on the Syrian coast. Great Britain wants it as the only suitable port to h Mesopotamian acquisition. Russia wants it as an all-land route outlet to the sea over 700 miles shorter than Constantinople would be.

The creation of an independent Armenian state, under the joint protection of the Entente powers, has already been agreed upon in principle. The boundaries of the proposed state are those roughly given by Mr. Simonds, including the provinces of Adana, Sivas, Kharput, Sanjak of Kaisserieh, northwest corner of Aleppo, which comprise lesser Armenia, together with the southwestern end of Erzerum and the port of Alatcham, on the Black Sea. The proposed state shall be under joint protection, because a single protection, as suggested by Mr. Simonds, would be an inducement to temptation and would thus defeat its own object. The massacre of the Armenians by the Turks will not in the slightest degree change the proposed plan, because the Great Powers would not constitute themselves as the agents of the Turks by urging the Turkish argument that in view of the reduction in the number of Armenians the claim of the Armenians should be abated or deferred. It should be pointed out that out of about 5,000,000 Armenians the world over about 2,000,000 live under the Turk's rule, and that those now living in foreign lands would eagerly return to their own country, from which they were driven away by the Turk's misrule.

If the Entente Allies are to respect the principle of nationality then they must recognize the claim of the Jews in Judea. A country consisting of the provinces of Bayrout, south of Lebanon; Syria, south of Damascus, and the Sanjak of Jerusalem, exclusive of the city and environs, which should be internationalized, comprising about 29,000 square miles, should be created into a Jewish state, under the joint protection of the powers, similar to Armenia. The Jews have a legitimate title to the land in question. They have moral and physical fitness for self-rule. A Jewish state within the proposed boundaries would not conflict with the vital interest of any power. Moreover, by the creation of a Jewish state a most practical and generous step shall have been taken for the solution of the Jewish problem.

A STUDENT OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS.

New York, Oct. 1, 1916.

Immoral Gladness.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I read a few days since a very clever and, to my mind, just criticism of "Pollyanna" by Heywood Broun. I have seen several attacks upon it, but none supporting it, and if the subject is not too worn I should like to contribute a word to the discussion.

Mr. Broun bases his criticism upon a better knowledge of human nature than the author's when he says that the doctrine of perpetual gladness is immoral. Technically anything that is false to truth is immoral, and to find something to be glad about everything would bring humanity to a state of mind at once monotonous and unnatural. People simply are not built that way. But to my mind the literary psychology of the work is all wrong in that Pollyanna herself is not true to child-life. Where has any one of your 100,000 readers ever met a paragon of goodness like her? And which one of them would want to? Children of that age are not given to making missionaries of themselves, at least not for very long. They do not possess the continuity of purpose, nor would a little girl with a really sensitive and sympathetic heart, the only kind that could bring gladness where it was needed, preach it in the cold-blooded priggish way that Pollyanna does. Fancy being old and crippled and being told by a vigorous, pink cheeked baby to be glad about it!

Mr. Broun rebels against the doctrine of "glad at any price," not, it seems to me, because he does not wish more gladness in the world, but because he would prefer to see the sources of gladness increased, rather than an increase of contentment with misfortune. And in that the author follows a lesser theme. The play deserves all that Mr. Broun said of it. He might also have said, as he did of "Upstairs and Down," that psychologically it is bad art. Christ himself was a man of sorrows.

BERTHA SANFORD.

Margaretville, N. Y., Oct. 3, 1916.

The German Element.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorials on the European crisis are to be commended; they are concise and to the point.

Although any fair-minded person would agree with your views, there are always to be found certain elements, who, though fully aware that this war was brought about by long prepared plans of Germany, will not be honest with themselves and confess the wrongs of that country.

It has been said quite frequently by different correspondents to various papers that the Entente are fighting as much for us as themselves, inasmuch as we stand for the same ideals. If this be so, how, then, in all common sense, can any true American wish to hamper the british or their Allies by constantly making representations of their method of blockade?

If, as we have been instructed by a number of our most prominent and learned Americans, who have frequently travelled in the war zone, it is to our interest to see the success of the Allies, then it is our duty to make the burden of the Entente as light as possible. No American wishes instructions on this grave crisis at the hands of the German element in this country. America is no place for those immigrants whose heart and soul are with the country of their birth or that of their ancestors.

A. EDWARDS.

West Orange, N. J., Sept. 28, 1916.

AMERICAN FUTURE IN CHINA

Commercial Co-operation with Japan Is Urged Instead of Economic Warfare.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Recent newspaper items report a projected loan under the auspices of the American International Corporation for the construction of railways in China. Aside from its vital interest for the student of economics and finance, such an enterprise has a fundamental significance of a far more serious nature.

That China is about to enter on a period of rapid and gigantic development by external forces and will become the playground of tremendous economic factors there is little doubt. The corollary of this statement is no less true, though perhaps not so generally recognized—that China constitutes one of the greatest menaces to the world's peace in the generations to come.

As Mr. Walter Lippman has ably pointed out in his "Stakes of Diplomacy," it is in the great undeveloped tracts of the habitable world that international friction is most frequently generated. It is here that the seeds of war are sown, through the inevitable conflict of unrestrained economic forces in the arenas where the great, greedy powers strive to realize their commercial ambitions.

For this reason the future of China constitutes one of America's most sinister sources of danger. Our relations with Japan are still amicable—on the surface, at least. Nevertheless, they seem at times to have been somehow infected with a growing sense of mutual distrust, and during the last few years too many disquieting murmurs have been heard.

Now, it seems to me that whenever a potentially dangerous contiguity of interests exists the alternative to friction is coöperation. One or the other of the parties must come forward and extend a clean right hand of sincerity.

Our opportunity is at the door. Now is the time—before emotional race hatred has been crystallized, along with the other symptoms of perverted patriotism which follow in the train of economic conflict between nations—for our financiers and our diplomats to show their foresight.

Let those who hold sway over the destinies of nations inaugurate a new era of internationalism by setting an example of international coöperation in the development of an economically backward land.

Let America and Japan, instead of tending toward inevitable conflict in the Far East and in the Pacific by pursuing head-on policies of economic invasion in coveted territories, get together and adopt methods which may prevent such a catastrophe.

Let there be joint administration, joint conferences, joint profits. Let joint financial committees and joint boards of directors (by no means excluding representatives of the other interested powers when these shall once more have time and capital to devote to external affairs) carry on the work of building up China in a safe and sane manner, with a community of interests instead of a disparity, and with sincerity the watchword instead of suspicion.

There will be much to learn from our vigorous and clever neighbor across the Pacific; let us teach him in return the way to preeminence without the horrid necessity of conquest, and let us show the world that America, at least, knows how to abstain from wrapping up its commercial aspirations and its dearest, worthiest traditions in one red vestment of blood! SAMUEL W. STRAUSS.

New York, Oct. 4, 1916.

"War Words."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "Boche" is a term derived from the Turanian branch of human speech, and is a household word freely used in the Turkish dialect; it means: Empty; vacant; useless; idle; simpleton; stupid; dull. V. C.

New York, Sept. 28, 1916.